

## **LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP AUTHORITY MEETING**

### Minutes of Township Authority Meeting held May 28, 2013

The regular quarterly meeting of the Lower Paxton Township Authority was called to order at 6 p.m. by Chairman William C. Seeds, Sr., on the above date in the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Authority members present in addition to Mr. Seeds were: William B. Hawk, William L. Hornung, Gary A. Crissman, and David B. Blain. Also in attendance were George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steven Stine, Authority Solicitor; William Weaver, Authority Department Director; Mark Hilson, Authority Engineer and Jim Wetzel, Authority Operations Manager; Jeff Wendle and Kevin Shannon, CET; and Ted Robertson and Watson Fisher, SWAN.

### **Pledge of Allegiance**

Mr. Blain led in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the May 7, 2013 Authority meeting minutes. Mr. Hawk seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

### **Public Comment**

No public comment was presented.

### **Board Members' Comment**

No comments were provided by Board members.

### **New Business**

#### Resolution 13-10-01 through 13-10-03; authorizing condemnation for sanitary sewer easements in the PC1GDA/GDB mini-basin project

Mr. Weaver noted that this resolution provides for the condemnation for sanitary sewer easements for properties located at 3817 Linglestown Road, 3917 Linglestown Road, and 4041 Linglestown Road. He noted that the project is next on the list for the Paxton Creek Corrective

Action Plan. He noted that Mr. Hilson has worked with CET the past six months to finalized the design and recently posted it on PENNBID and advertised in the newspaper. He noted that staff recommends to proceed with these condemnations.

Mr. Blain made a motion to approve Resolution 13-10-01 through 13-10-03, authorizing the condemnation for sanitary sewer easements in the PC1GDA/GDB mini basin project as presented by Mr. Weaver. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Resolution 13-11-01 through 13-11-07; authorizing condemnation for temporary construction easements for private sewers in the PC1GDA/GDB mini-basin project

Mr. Weaver noted that this resolution provides for the condemnation for temporary construction easements for properties located at 3907 Dora Drive, 2186 Paxton Drive, 2197 Paxton Drive, 3830 Dora Drive, 3831 Dora Drive, 3910 Mark Avenue, and 3920 Mark Avenue. He noted that these easements are required for the private sewer replacement agreements. He noted that he mailed a 30 day notice followed by a certified 30 day notice providing for a total of 60 days for the property owners to sign the easements. He noted that staff recommends to proceed with these condemnations.

Mr. Hawk made a motion to approve Resolution 13-11-01 through 13-11-07, authorizing the condemnation for temporary construction easements for private sewers in the PC1GDA/GDB mini basin project as presented by Mr. Weaver. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Approval of Oakhurst Interceptor Agreement

Mr. Weaver noted that the Oakhurst Interceptor project is ready to proceed. He explained that the agreement was updated by the Susquehanna Township Authority Solicitor Jim Clippinger, with comments provided by Mr. Stine, Mr. Wendle, and himself. He explained that Mr. Wendle and he made significant comments in terms of the detail.

Mr. Weaver noted that the project first started with the Union Deposit Corporation who had to halt the process since they could not get the easement from Mr. Vartan. He noted that after Mr. Vartan passed away, his son gave the easement to Donco Construction who put in the pipe for his project. He noted that the Authority participated by increasing the size of the pipe and paying for the materials. He noted that everyone made out for the first phase of the project. He explained that the second phase concerns that point from where that pipe ends. He noted that

everyone is ready to move ahead, especially since the Gale Drive Pump Station needs to be taken out of service as it is more than 40 years old and the parts are not available. He noted that the Union Deposit Corporation is ready to move ahead with the Sportsman's Golf Course development and they are ready to proceed with development plans in Susquehanna Township. He noted, according to Susquehanna Township's Act 537 Plan, the development cannot proceed until this interceptor is built. He noted that there is a small portion of it in Susquehanna Township, but the majority of the project requires this interceptor as part of the Act 537 Plan.

Mr. Weaver noted that the reason for the addendum is that Donco wanted to move forward with its development. He noted that Mr. Wendle will speak to the fact that it was not anticipated that the North Branch Interceptor would have to be expanded.

Mr. Wendle noted in 1998, there was an agreement between the Susquehanna and Lower Paxton Township Authorities to build the Oakhurst Interceptor and share the costs. He noted that Donco paid for a good portion of the project with the rest shared by the two authorities. He noted that it was done to accommodate the changes in the North Branch and because the cost sharing had changed from the original agreement as Donco paid for the construction and Lower Paxton paid for the pipe and materials for its share. He noted that the cost sharing was based on percentage use.

Mr. Wendle noted for the original project, the upper part of the project near Gale Drive is what remains to be constructed. He projected 1.62 mgd peak flow to come into the interceptor and at the location at North Progress Avenue there is a line called the Woodbridge Interceptor. He noted, in the original agreement, the two authorities agreed that Lower Paxton would pay for 90% of the upgrade as it was not needed by Susquehanna Township but they would pay 10% for betterment. He explained that he requested a change to that because of the cost of doing the North Branch further down the pipe, noting that there was no need to do anything to the Woodbridge Interceptor until such time as the flows get high enough that it is needed. He noted, instead of doing it as part of the right-of-way, there was still a 90/10 cost share, but not until the flows reach 90% of its capacity. He noted in 1998 it was estimated to cost \$170,000, but it will be delayed until sometime in the future. He noted that was a change to the agreement.

Mr. Wendle noted that the major change concerns the North Branch near the Paxton Creek Interceptor, the main trunk that runs along Walker Mill Road in Susquehanna Township, noting that the two connect to each other at that location. He explained that much of the metering

was done 14 years ago, when we did not have the good data that we have now. He suggested running a model for what would occur when we connect the pumping station into the North Branch of the interceptor as it has a lot of flow in it that Susquehanna is working to remove. He noted that he ran the model and it found if the pumping station was tied into this we could have an overflow. He noted, at first Susquehanna suggested that we are only doing this for Lower Paxton as he suggested that Susquehanna has no room for additional development either. He noted that the interceptor needs to be expanded and rather than put that burden on Lower Paxton, Susquehanna proposed to share the cost of this interceptor based upon the design capacity of the interceptor. He noted the bottom part of the North Branch has enough capacity, and when it is replaced it will provide for an additional .63 mgd which would take care of some of the pumping station load. He noted as you move further north and replace those sections, it would be enough capacity for what both authorities need for the future. He explained that the agreement is tied as a cost sharing agreement for the North Branch of the Interceptor by segment and as we move downstream, Susquehanna's share becomes larger. He noted that the two major changes are the delay of the Woodbridge Interceptor and providing for cost sharing for the North Branch.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the Woodbridge Interceptor is in Lower Paxton Township. Mr. Wendle answered that it is in Susquehanna Township. Mr. Seeds questioned why we have 90% of the upgrade. Mr. Wendle answered that when it was tied in; the only reason it would have to be upgraded is because of Lower Paxton's flow. He noted that Susquehanna Township has enough capacity to serve their Township. Mr. Seeds noted, in the future, Lower Paxton will have to assume cost sharing for that interceptor when it is upgraded. Mr. Wendle answered yes.

Mr. Seeds questioned why the metering is done between April 1<sup>st</sup> and November 30<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Wendle answered that is the wet weather season and he does it at that time, rather than metering all year round. He noted that the City of Harrisburg wanted year round metering, and Susquehanna Township told them that they did not want to do that, but would meter during the wet weather months. Mr. Seeds questioned who pays for that. Mr. Wendle answered that according to the agreement Lower Paxton would pay for their metering and Susquehanna would pay for their metering.

Mr. Seeds questioned what the total cost to Lower Paxton was. Mr. Wendle answered that the cost for the North Branch is \$1 million of which the Township's share would be \$250,000, and the other cost would be for the Oakhurst Interceptor. Mr. Weaver explained that it

is a lot cheaper than upgrading the pump station. He noted that it is part of the Act 537 Plan that Lower Paxton has to do or development could not occur north of this which would be the Union Deposit Corporation property. He noted for the Woodridge Interceptor, the upgrade to the agreement was changed that it is not needed at this time. He noted that we have to do the North Branch, but if the flows stay below the capacities, there would be no need to provide the upgrade for the Woodbridge Interceptor at this time. Mr. Wendle noted that the total costs are in the two exhibits in the agreement, some of which has already been paid for. Mr. Weaver noted that the Township's share of the North Branch, 24% of cost is \$230,000 and the Oakhurst Interceptor is \$298,000, totaling a little over a half million for both projects.

Mr. Hornung questioned when the project would be started. Mr. Wendle answered that the agreement states as soon as the agreement is executed, Susquehanna Township will start to design it. He noted that we do not want to hold up getting the Oakhurst Interceptor approved by the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), so they committed to design it as quickly as possible. Mr. Seeds questioned if CET would be doing that work. Mr. Wendle answered yes. He noted that a good portion of this has been designed by Dauphin Engineering for Union Deposit Corporation, and he agreed that there is no need to redo it as he would use their design.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the Susquehanna Township Authority has approved the agreement. Mr. Wendle answered that they sent it to Lower Paxton Authority for its approval and they will approve it on June 3<sup>rd</sup>. Mr. Crissman noted that he wants to make sure if we approve it tonight, it is a done deal. He noted that he does not want any changes. Mr. Wendle answered that he did not think that would happen since they approved sending it to Lower Paxton to seek the Board's approval. He noted that their solicitor approved the agreement and their Authority Board has had the agreement for several months and they approved it during their last meeting to send it to Lower Paxton to seek its approval. Mr. Crissman noted that he prefers to sign a document last.

Mr. Seeds noted that we would be approving what they sent us and if they want to make a change they would have to make an addendum to it.

Mr. Hornung questioned if Susquehanna will run the project. Mr. Wendle answered that they will run the project for the rest of the North Branch. Mr. Hornung questioned who would approve a change order. Mr. Wendle answered that there is a provision in the agreement that anything over \$4,000 would require approval from both Lower Paxton and Susquehanna

Authorities as well as Lower Paxton approving the plan. Mr. Crissman questioned if Mr. Wendle was satisfied with the checks and balances for the agreement. Mr. Wendle answered yes. He noted that it is pretty much the same conditions for change orders and approval of plans and specifications.

Mr. Hawk suggested that there are no major concerns on CET's part. Mr. Wendle answered that Susquehanna's solicitor put it together and Mr. Stine reviewed it.

Mr. Crissman questioned if Mr. Stine was happy with their solicitor's opinion. Mr. Stine answered that he had to tweak some words as there were way too many words. He noted that it seems fine to him as he went over it several times.

Mr. Seeds questioned when you would predict that we would decommission the Gale Drive Pump Station. Mr. Hilson answered that it would be decommissioned with the construction of the PC1GDA/GDB replacement project; about a nine month project. He noted that it was posted on PENNBID on Friday with bid opening scheduled for the end of June; probably nine to twelve months. He noted to get the sewer up Linglestown Road, the force main from Gale Drive is in the way, so the timing of the Oakhurst Interceptor is very important as we need it to finish the PC1GDA/GDB project.

Mr. Wendle noted that the Oakhurst Interceptor was sent to DEP for permitting so as soon as the Townships receive the permit, they start it so it is timed for the completion of PC1GDA/GDB. Mr. Shannon noted that we need three permits for the Oakhurst Interceptor, we have two and DEP expects to issue the water quality management permit at the end of this month, so it could be bid as long as the agreement is signed by both parties.

Mr. Wendle noted that he would present it during the Susquehanna Township Authority Board meeting to be advertised at the same time they approve in order to speed up the process.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the North Branch would follow after. Mr. Wendle answered that it would take a year and a half to finish. Mr. Weaver noted that he was afraid that DEP would not issue the permit but they said it was "in the mail" because the North Branch will have an overflow, noting that we are transferring flow from point A to point B, noting that it is the same flow that is in the Paxton Creek Interceptor, and the North Branch is overflowing now. Mr. Wendle explained to DEP that we are taking an overflow from the pump station and moving it downstream to the North Branch, but not increasing the number of overflows. He noted that the

volume will be less because we are doing PC1GDA/GDB at this time so it will drop the volume in the long run.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the North Branch goes across any streams. Mr. Wendle answered that it has stream crossings in it as it is part of the permitting process noting that it would be faster if there were no streams in that area.

Mr. Hornung questioned when it comes to paving the streets; he assumed that it would be patching the pavement. Mr. Wendle noted that there are no paved areas, noting that it is all right-of-way. He noted that it is very similar to the Trunk A project that was completed. Mr. Weaver noted that it is a good deal for everyone as Susquehanna will get a new line and we will get rid of the pump station and accommodate for future development.

Mr. Seeds noted that there is mention of flow and that we have to report if we have overflows. He questioned what the Authority's capacity is. Mr. Weaver answered that it will be 1.62 mgd. He questioned what all the numbers were in the agreement. Mr. Weaver explained that is how we are writing the agreements with Swatara and Susquehanna as it makes sense that when you get to a certain capacity in the pipe that you start looking at things. He noted during the wet weather season we have to meet certain criteria and we will have a permanent meter and will always monitor flows. He noted that the agreement provides for 80% but we will advise the Board at 50% flow. Mr. Wendle noted that he put in the agreement that at 85%, and decided to define what that is, for this particular one, the 2 mgd was saying that we put in all these metering stations, but he said there is no need to meter a individual section until the total section gets to 80%. He noted when the flows in the total line get to that percentage, then we will start to talk about having to put in additional meters. He noted that he is trying to control the costs for metering.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the 2.57 mgd was the maximum because 2.0 mgd is approximately 80%. Mr. Wendle noted that 2.57 mgd is the shared maximum capacity for the Oakhurst Interceptor which is 1.62 mgd for Lower Paxton and .95 mgd for Susquehanna Authority.

Mr. Weaver noted that it takes care of the Township for all future development in that area.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the Oakhurst Interceptor Agreement as presented by Mr. Weaver. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

#### Approval of the Swatara 2013 Agreement

Mr. Weaver noted that he received a lot of assistance from Mr. Wendle and cooperation from Swatara Township Authority (STA) in order to reach the current agreement. He reported that STA did not deny any comments made by Mr. Wendle. Mr. Stine agreed.

Mr. Weaver noted that the Swatara Wastewater Treatment Plant (SWTP) and interceptor were designed and built in 1972 and expanded in 1985. He noted since that time the Chesapeake Bay Nutrient requirements were established and it required another expansion, noting that the Lower Paxton Township Authority (LPTA) provided \$14.2 million for its share of the upgrades. He noted that before the SWTP came on line it was flooded and heavily damaged.

Mr. Weaver noted that part of the process involved issues with the agreement that all the parties wanted to resolve. He noted that they combined all the previous agreements as part of the Chesapeake Bay Expansion. He noted that it provided Mr. Wendle the opportunity to discuss the reserve capacity issue related to the total capacity at the plant and an increase of the maximum monthly flow. He noted that the agreements in the past were written for a capacity of 3.695 mgd, not including a maximum monthly flow that the treatment plant had. He noted that Mr. Wendle was very instrumental in getting STA to provide a new maximum month flow which increased the LPTA flow to 5.3 mgd. He noted that this greatly increased its capacity and provided for everything that Mr. Wendle was looking for and also additional capacity in the joint interceptor as well.

Mr. Hornung questioned if we would have a bigger portion of future costs along with the increased capacity. Mr. Weaver answered that the percentage stayed the same. He noted that STA took on a lot of West Hanover Township's capacity so their percent increased to 30% but Mr. Wendle suggested that it is really 29.49%. Mr. Seeds noted that West Hanover Township (WHT) no longer sends anything to the SWTP Plant. Mr. Wolfe noted except for what comes through Lower Paxton Township. Mr. Seeds questioned who got WHT's capacity. Mr. Weaver answered that the LPTA received 100,000 gallons. Mr. Seeds questioned if we ever got any capacity from Hummelstown. Mr. Weaver answered that we are still working on that. He



explained that the old Verdelli Farms Plant was abandoned and they are now building apartments there. He noted that we were really close to buying it but there were some issues with metering in that STA thought they had some high flows and Hummelstown found out about the Verdelli Farms Plan and they got cold feet thinking that they would need the capacity. He noted once they can get better meter readings from Hummelstown, then we plan on meeting with them to see what is available.

Mr. Hornung questioned why STA grabbed the extra capacity from WHT. Mr. Weaver answered that they got it for a really good price, just like we did. Mr. Hornung questioned if STA has I&I issues. Mr. Weaver answered in the Derry Street area, but overall they don't as they don't have the extensive system that we have and their lots are small. Mr. Hornung questioned if STA has much more build out available. Mr. Wendle answered that they bought all the capacity from WHT and then sold the Township some at the same price plus 5%. He noted that they only sold 100,000 mgd out of 400,000 mgd. He noted, at that time, they anticipated some industrial development.

Mr. Seeds questioned if STA had the right to purchase WHT's capacity. Mr. Wendle suggested that they got it because they were the first to grab it. Mr. Seeds noted that the Authority had discussions with WHT years ago but they could not reach an agreement. Mr. Wolfe noted that there was a settlement of an arbitration of litigation where WHT wanted out of the annual debt service payments because they weren't using it, so STA told them that they still had to pay and LPTA tried to buy the capacity but WHT provided an inflated price and LPTA backed out. He noted that WHT filed suit against STA to get out and as a result of the settlement STA was forced to buy the remaining settlement.

Mr. Weaver noted that one of the issues that we were concerned about is the joint use interceptor in that we have a restriction because we don't have a maximum month flow of 5.38 mgd and it is not big enough. He asked the Board permission to model it and STA agreed, and the model showed that it can carry more flow. He noted that it was good news as we have all this capacity at the plant, but yet we couldn't get it there.

Mr. Weaver noted that this is the first time that someone has tried to limit capacities on nutrients. He and Mr. Wendle convinced STA that they really shouldn't worry about it as the plant was designed to treat nutrients and it should be fine. He noted that we are not going to give them any excess nutrients. He noted that the industry has maximum nutrient limits and he

wanted to get that into the agreement so there was some discussion and Mr. Wendle came up with some creative discussions.

Mr. Weaver noted that this agreement is part of the consent order and settlement agreement where it is an exhibit to the second consent decree. He noted that he thought it was a done deal and that they would use the old one as the exhibit but there were discussions with Gary Hepford and Scott Wyland, noting that they didn't want to get this approved by the judge until this was done. He explained that this agreement is holding up the judge's approval for the new consent order. He explained that he wants to get it approved by the judge.

Mr. Wendle noted that Exhibit B shows that in the old days the plant capacity was 6.3 mgd average daily flow and had a maximum peak hourly flow of 12 mgd. He noted that it was ridiculous for when the plant was built, and upgraded in 1985, the existing plant had 3 mgd average daily flows, 9 mgd peak hourly flows, and they added 3 mgd of average daily flow and didn't add any additional peak flows. He noted when they did the newest upgrades they fixed it and so they have a reasonable peaking factor and he insisted that they put in these values because it was what was in the engineers' design report. He noted if you had an average monthly flow over 3.795 mgd with the 100,000 mgd bought from Swatara Township, and you were over it for the month you got a slap on the wrist, but if you were over for two months, STA stopped the connections until the engineers met to bring the flows under control. He noted that now 5.389 mgd is the number, so you have more monthly average capacity that you are allowed to have. He noted that built into it are some triggers but the 5.389 mgd is the primary one. He noted if you are over a certain percentage of your annual average flow, something has to be done as there is a problem. He noted that Mr. Weaver mentioned nutrients; the plant nutrient effluent load is an annual load. He noted if the plant would go over its load of 6.3 mgd, they would automatically be in violation, unless their nitrogen removal was above and beyond what the design was. He noted that you would automatically go over just because of flow. He noted that there is some language that ties the monthly average flows with past history, but we requested that it would tie this into an annual average flow providing for a violation if you exceed your monthly average for so many months out of the year. He noted that you have a lot more monthly average, noting if you are less than 5.89 mgd for a month, nothing will happen, even if you are over 3.795 mgd.

Mr. Wendle noted that at the bottom of this exhibit, STA allocated nutrient capacity, assigning each municipality a nutrient loading, but his objection was that it was tied into if you

exceeded your nutrient load you would have to provide the difference of what STA could have sold nutrient credits for, and STA took it out of there. He noted that they just use the term pollutants, so if any party puts a pollutant in the system to keep them from meeting their permit requirements then there is going to be an investigation for who is contributing to the violation. He noted that ultimately they gave LPTA nitrogen and phosphorus limits to discharge to the plant and he objected to this because it was not changed and he thinks the nutrient level should be for what it was when STA designed the treatment plant. Mr. Wendle noted that STA designed the treatment plant based upon existing data but they did not ask if LPTA wanted to buy more nutrient capacity or anything since everything is based on flow and now all of a sudden they put Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) loadings, total suspended loadings and nutrient loadings on everyone. He noted that is not right because if before hand we had an extra strong waste that we wanted to buy some capacity for, no one had an opportunity to do that. He noted that he objected but STA did not change it, but he does not think it will present a problem for the Township.

Mr. Crissman questioned what causes STA to be at .588 pounds per year. Mr. Wendle noted that it is a percentage of all the pounds that they are allocated. Mr. Wendle noted that they are allocated 115,367 pounds per year in the effluent. Mr. Wendle noted that these numbers are distributed to all the parties. Mr. Weaver noted that STA has 30%. Mr. Wendle noted that these are the effluent and not influent limits. Mr. Crissman requested Mr. Wendle to define the terms. Mr. Wendle noted that the effluent limit is what they can discharge into the stream and those are your share of what can be discharged into the stream, but the BOD loading is what you are allowed to discharge to the treatment plant and they should be consistent. He noted if you do approve this, he must make sure that these are consistent for the influent loadings from each of the municipalities. Mr. Weaver noted that he is not recommending approval for tonight of Exhibits B and E as they are not correct. Mr. Wendle noted that STA has assigned mass loadings of pollutants that were never done before and there was no opportunity to comment on sharing of costs before the plant was designed and constructed based upon anything other than flow. He noted that we objected and they did not agree to it and the he thinks there will be no issues with the loadings.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the annual average flow is sufficient going from three to five. Mr. Wendle noted that is the maximum monthly flow; the annual average flow continues to be

3.795 mgd. He noted that the 5 mgd is a maximum monthly flow. He noted that you used to be judged monthly based on your annual average. He noted when the Authority is over, it is not over the annual average, it is over the monthly flow. He noted that those numbers were based upon the plant capacity and the fact that they were not expanding the plant anymore than 6.3 mgd. He noted that they refused to build a bigger plant to accommodate infiltration. He explained that those numbers were fixed.

Mr. Hornung questioned what would cause the LPTA to exceed the nutrient level. Mr. Wendle answered if you got some type of commercial business that had a lot of nitrogen, such as vegetable processors. He noted that STA could have a substantial amount of nitrogen from the Verdelli Farms processing plant. Mr. Wolfe noted that is why at some point in time the Township may want to look at a residential compost program as opposed to vegetables going down the garbage disposal. Mr. Hornung questioned if that is where the nitrogen comes from. Mr. Wendle noted yes, and from people as well, urea.

Mr. Weaver noted that there is always a certain level of phosphorus and nitrogen in treatment plants and you could take samples all around the country and you would be within 10% to 15% as long as there were no industrial or commercial plants. He noted that STA was concerned with the Township going over the level and Mr. Wendle was concerned with STA putting in limits; this has been around for 30 to 50 years and it will not change. Mr. Hornung questioned if we should change our Comprehensive Plan or zoning. Mr. Weaver noted that the flows match the load and as long as we stay under our flows, we will not go over our loading. Mr. Hornung questioned if we should watch out if someone wanted to put in a vegetable processing plant. Mr. Wolfe noted that there are minimal available plots of land that would permit that. He noted that we are primarily a residential/commercial area with more people than plants.

Mr. Weaver noted that the new SWTP runs great. He noted that they are getting the removals.

Mr. Weaver noted for Exhibit C, the capacity in the joint use interceptor, the peak hourly flow of the plant is 18 mgd and if you look at the total allocated capacity for the joint use interceptor, it is actually 12.5 mgd, but for the plant it is around 18 mgd. He noted the model showed that the joint use interceptor could carry substantially more than 12.5 mgd without an overflow. Mr. Hornung questioned if that is all that goes into that plant. Mr. Wendle noted that

there is also a little bit from STA. He noted that he wants to be able to send everything to STA that we can send before we have to store. He noted that they wanted to verify the modeling and add the additional information later but he did not want to do that. He noted that they added this in section 3.04, this paragraph: "It is further acknowledged that recent modeling of the Joint Use Interceptors indicated that the carrying capacity of the Joint Use Interceptor is greater than the sum of the allocated capacities in Exhibit C. It is agreed that further verification of the model will be done using metering data and field measurements satisfactory to Swatara to establish the safe carrying capacity of the Joint Use Interceptor without the threats of backups." He noted that this is the same language that is found in the second consent decree which allows LPTA to have surcharging of the line without backups in the basements. He further quotes: "Once the safe carrying capacity is determined by agreement of the parties, the safe carrying capacity of the Joint Use Interceptor will be allocated in proportion to the allocations presented in Exhibit C, and Exhibit C will be revised to show those allocations, which shall not exceed any party's peak instantaneous flow allocation in the Treatment Plant. He noted when the capacity is agreed upon this exhibit will be amended."

Mr. Weaver noted that this was a key issue because the 5.3 mgd increased from 3.75 mgd at the plant and the old JUI has a 7.4 limit which is only a two-to-one peaking factor of the 3.695 mgd and the peaking factor is a lot higher than two-to-one. He noted that he hopes to get down to a little peaking factor when we are done with the program, but even at that we still need more capacity to be closer to matching what is at the plant, and the model will get us very close if not there.

Mr. Wendle noted that the current allocated capacity is 7.5 mgd and a peak hourly flow allocation of the plant of 9.5 mgd so it is an additional 2 mgd if the model verifies.

Mr. Hornung questioned if we overflow where we send it. Mr. Wendle noted that it starts to overflow at around 12 mgd. Mr. Weaver noted that there have been some changes as they built a big pump station at STA which draws the water down really low so we don't overflow as quickly as we used to. Mr. Wendle noted if you get your plant peak hourly flow capacity in the Joint Use Interceptor, you would have 9.5 mgd. He noted that STA has also agreed if you exceed your peak hourly capacity, there is a fine of around \$1,000 but we have taken everyone else's capacity and they haven't said anything about that. He noted that is part of the reason why we did the model.

Mr. Weaver noted that it was very odd on the negotiations for the Joint Use Interceptor. He noted that they did not like the idea of the safe carrying capacity at first until Mr. Wendle got the language and showed it to them. He noted that Mike Kreiser bought all the extra capacity that was in the pipe. Mr. Wendle showed them in the model that it can carry much more water so all we are asking for is it be divided up based upon the share of the of the plant capacity. He noted that we finally got them to agree. He noted that it does provide for a fine of \$1,000 per day but Mr. Wendle's calculation is that even during a very bad month we would only pay for tow or three days. Mr. Wendle noted when you exceed your peak hourly flow in any 24 hour period it would be \$1,000 and you don't do that very often during the year, maybe five or six times. Mr. Wendle noted that everyone is subject to that fine. Mr. Weaver noted with the way the flows are dropping with the I&I program, it won't take long to get down to zero.

Mr. Weaver noted that it has been a long process and he wanted to share all this information with the Authority members, requesting that the Board condition the approval on revising Exhibits B and E, and it must be certified by CET.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Wendle is satisfied with the agreement. Mr. Wendle answered that they took almost every recommendation that we made except for the loadings and the fine. Mr. Weaver noted that he was happy with it.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the agreement with Swatara Township Authority for 2013 with Exhibits B and E subject to final approval by counsel, staff and engineer. Mr. Hawk seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds noted that South Hanover Township is in the agreement but they don't have a representative on the engineering committee. Mr. Wendle noted that they are not in the plant at this time. Mr. Weaver noted that they have capacity but no connection. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

### **Township Reports**

#### **Review status of Second Consent Decree mini-basin sewer replacement projects**

Mr. Hilson noted that we have five mini-basin replacement projects going on at this time with a total contract value of \$19 million. He noted that \$6 million has been completed to date and they recently started the BC 6 project that surrounds the Municipal Center. He noted that the project started on South Houcks Road and is working in the area of McDonalds. He noted that contract was let to Doli Construction. He noted that Doli is rapidly closing in on the SC-1E

project and will move to the restrictor project. He noted that Ronca and Sons is working on curbs, sidewalks, driveways and lawns.

Mr. Hilson noted that we looked at the BC 6 while on road tour and discussed that the project is a little unique in the way it was built. He noted that Mr. Hornung questioned the cost comparison of the mini-basin projects that we normally see to doing an apartment complex. He noted that on an EDU basis it is about half the cost due to the concentration of the units and since they pay the same amount when they get a sewer bill as a residential area, it is about half. He noted that the work is more complicated as you run into more unknowns. He noted that although it is more tedious to design it is worthwhile doing the apartments.

Mr. Hilson noted that Wexcon just started the work for the Forest Hills Interceptor project, and they are now getting into the deeper sections so it will be interesting to see if they hit rock and how the trenches hold up. He noted that the Forest Hills building sewer replacement program is moving along but we have some pipe that is below minimum slope and issues with some mainline and a lot of issues with manholes. He noted that there is a lot of I&I coming in through the manholes and we are now looking at doing a manhole replacement project. Mr. Wetzel noted that it is in the area where the pipe is connected to the manholes. Mr. Hornung questioned if it was poor installation or worn out. Mr. Wetzel suggested that it is a combination of both. He noted that in the past there were various contractors doing the work, such as Wintermyer, Boyd Diller and Baker. Mr. Weaver suggested that it was also a material issue as well. Mr. Hilson noted that the work was not done by current contractors but some of the current workers worked on the earlier projects. Mr. Weaver noted that the PSX seal for manhole pipe penetrations works well. He noted that they didn't have that technology in the early 1980's.

Mr. Wendle noted that it is further compounded by steep sections of sewer, big changes in grades and the manholes at the bottom put the pipe under pressure and if you have a leak, it flows out and into the manhole. Mr. Hilson noted that it is hard to get a good seal if you have a pipe that is steep as the manhole is flat and it is not set on an angle. He noted back in the day it was hard to get that tight and there is a lot of water up in the mountain.

Mr. Hornung questioned what are you going to do, are you going to replace manholes. Mr. Hilson answered yes. Mr. Weaver noted that staff would not recommend lining.

Mr. Wetzel noted once school is out, Ronca will be working on North Mountain Road so there will be some detouring at that location.

Mr. Weaver noted that this is the most work we have ever attempted to do at one time and we have ten to twelve inspectors, five from staff, and people from CET and HRG. He noted that that he has not received any major complaints from the public and CET continues to get the designs out in time. He noted that we are on schedule.

Mr. Seeds suggested that the people are getting used to the sewer construction projects. Mr. Weaver noted that the biggest complaints are yards and utility notification. He explained that we are having a big problem with Verizon as they do not know where their lines are located. He noted that the people in Forest Hills are losing their cable, phone and Internet service.

#### Account Balances

Mr. Weaver noted that this is a reconciled balance for the operating funds and investment funds and total available funds as of April 30, 2013. He noted that we have \$10,467,000 and for the restricted investments, it is \$23,823,000. He noted that we continue to have a surplus of available cash and the restricted amount must be spent by the end of 2014. He noted that in one quarter we went from \$29 million to \$23 million for the restricted funds. He noted that we continue to get good bid pricing.

#### Longhorn Steakhouse

Mr. Weaver noted that the Longhorn Steakhouse will be located in the ARA mini-basin. He noted that Susquehanna Township has an overload in their sewer system that effects Lower Paxton. He explained that we had a hydraulic overload during extreme events that was corrected with the recent mini-basin projects. He noted that we are in a non-over load condition, however, Susquehanna is doing the Corrective Action Plan and we can't issue permits freely. He noted that Longhorn Steakhouse needs 11 EDU's for their project and LPTA only has 2.5 EDU's. He noted that he is sending a letter to the Longhorn Steakhouse engineer informing him that he will be approving the Planning Module with the caveat that they sign a hold harmless agreement and noting that Susquehanna Township needs to apply for the permits for Longhorn Steakhouse as Susquehanna Township can't give them directly to the Township since we are not under an over load. He noted that the permits go through Susquehanna and they share them with Lower Paxton. He noted that Longhorn Steakhouse needs 8.5 EDU's or permits.

Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Weaver's letter stated that it needed 350 gpd but Mr. Wendle stated that it should be 250 gpd. Mr. Weaver noted that we had three numbers, 180, 250 and 350. He noted that they all mean something to each process. Mr. Weaver noted that we are



talking about issued permits and we issue permits at 350 gpd. He noted that it increases the amount of what we get for tapping fees, but it reduces the number of permits that they need. Mr. Weaver noted that 180 gpd is what a house uses, but they have a 4,000 gpd capacity and when you divide it by 180 gpd, it comes out to 20 EDU's but we won't use up all 20 permits as we can use 350 gpd as the capacity and it equates 11.5 EDU's. Mr. Wendle noted that DEP said to use 350 gpd for commercial.

Mr. Weaver noted that it is good for the Authority as we did not use that number back in 2002.

Mr. Seeds noted that he did not understand how Susquehanna Township could give LPTA permits. Mr. Weaver answered that they apply to DEP, and based upon reduction in flows, DEP issues permits that they share with us. He noted that there would be no basis for DEP to deny Susquehanna Township's request.

Mr. Weaver noted that we gave Susquehanna nine permits seven or eight years ago as we had no development in the ARA mini-basin. He noted that they could return those nine permits; we deserve permits as we have no overloads. He noted that we will request that Susquehanna apply to DEP to get the permits; however, if they say no, then we go to Susquehanna and try to get the nine permits back as they have 15 at this time.

Mr. Crissman questioned what would DEP position be knowing that we gave Susquehanna the permits. Mr. Weaver noted that they don't know anything about that as it was part of an intermunicipal agreement. Mr. Weaver noted that Longhorn Steakhouse shouldn't apply for the permits until they have a planning module, but we can't approve the planning module until the plan is approved. He suggested that DEP will kick the application back until the planning module is approved.

Mr. Crissman questioned Mr. Weaver if he was asking Board approval to apply for those permits or will you just go to Susquehanna. Mr. Weaver suggested that we don't need Board action. He will move ahead to send a letter to Susquehanna to make that request on behalf of Longhorn Steakhouse.

#### GHD Agreement

Mr. Wendle explained that the existing agreement already calls for the transferring to successors and assignees, but to make it cleaner, he would like to execute an acknowledgement

that when the CET merger is completed on July 1, 2013, that CET will transfer the existing agreement to GHD. He noted that nothing will change other than the name.

Mr. Seeds questioned if we need to take action on this. Mr. Weaver noted that the original agreement allows the transfer. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Wendle is asking for an acknowledgement from the Authority that we know the transfer is occurring.

Mr. Seeds questioned if CET will no longer exist after July 1, 2013. Mr. Wendle noted that officially we will be GHD.

Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Stine if we need to do anything. Mr. Stine answered that you need to take action to sign the document.

Mr. Blain made a motion to accept the agreement to acknowledge the firm of GHD, formerly known as CET on all future engagements, documentation, etc. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

#### Update on MunicIPAY

Mr. Weaver noted that MunicIPAY is the company that the Board agreed to contract with to accept the payments for the Sewer Authority. He noted that Mr. Hornung had questioned about credit card fraud protection at the last meeting. Mr. Weaver noted that MunicIPAY is a pass through agency that has no fraud protection, noting that the fraud protection would be through the credit card company. Mr. Blain noted that MunicIPAY is the processor for the payments.

Mr. Weaver noted that MunicIPAY charges a fee... Mr. Hornung questioned who holds the credit card. Mr. Weaver answered the credit card company. Mr. Hornung questioned how they get it. Mr. Weaver answered that they process the payment; MunicIPAY takes the money and the number and gives the payment to us. Mr. Hornung questioned if they are the processor. Mr. Weaver answered that they pass it through to the credit card company, charge the customer and keep all the records. Mr. Hornung questioned who takes the credit card payment or is it only made online. Mr. Weaver answered that staff takes the credit card here at the office. He noted that he could show the Board members the new swipe machines after the meeting. Mr. Hornung questioned if the people call and provide the credit card number over the phone. Mr. Weaver answered yes or we can swipe the card at the Municipal Center.

Mr. Hawk noted that there is a \$3 charge to do that. Mr. Weaver answered yes.

Mr. Blain noted that MunicIPAY works for the credit card company since they are a third party administrator. He requested Mr. Weaver to ask MunicIPAY for their Soc Report. He noted that it is an audit of their internal control structure. He noted that they should be able to provide an audit opinion for the internal controls of the processing and it is usually done for the credit card company. He noted that the credit card company will want to know for sure that there is going to be security with the transfer of credit card numbers, personal information and it must show the security and that their internal controls are in place to insure that they are not susceptible to information being stolen.

Mr. Weaver noted that MunicIPAY charges a fee and they don't really do anything with credit card number storage.

Mr. Blain noted if MunicIPAY is not doing a Soc Report he would be a little concerned.

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Weisinger put the link to MunicIPAY on the front page of the Township's website, and Mr. Wolfe displayed what it looked like to a customer. He noted that staff and the receptionists have been trained for how the link works and they can answer questions for how to create an account and password to make a payment.

Mr. Hornung noted that his business is PC compliant, and it requires that anyone who handles credit cards on their computer must do certain things. He noted if there is storage, the person who has access to that must change their password every so often and their doors must be locked and must follow a slew of procedures. Mr. Hornung noted that it should be for the Township, not the processor. He noted that they should have one as well.

Mr. Weaver noted that we don't accept the credit card. Mr. Hornung noted if you swipe the credit card you have accepted it. He noted that the Township is required to be PC compliant which means that certain procedures must be followed whenever anyone has a credit card number. He noted that Township employees have access to the credit card. Mr. Weaver noted that the insurance agent spoke to him about this and asked a lot of questions about Official Payments and about accepting credit cards. He noted that you need to be insured against fraud or someone stealing a credit card and hacking into the system where it might be stored. He noted that we need to know what kind of software the Township has. Mr. Hornung noted that he had to change his virus protection as it was not strong enough on the tunnel BPM that changes the processing code that does the credit card. He noted that it gets kind of crazy.

Mr. Blain stated that Mr. Weaver better check into this. Mr. Weaver stated that he would, although he passed the test for the insurance agent and they did not require the Authority to have additional coverage or protection. He noted that the insurance agent spoke with PNC Bank, and Official Payments and they looked at all this and they were okay with it. He noted that he will look into PC Compliant. Mr. Hornung noted that his business insurance company has never called him to ask him if he was PC Compliant. He noted that they would not be the ones who do the auditing for that. He noted that there are a lot of procedures that he must follow to be PC Compliant in the event that someone steals your credit card there is an argument that he has been following the procedures. Mr. Weaver noted that he has heard all the stories from PNC Bank, and many other people. He noted, other than hacking into the computer that would be the only liability that the Authority would have as we don't store any of that information.

Mr. Wolfe noted that we will check to make sure we are compliant and have the necessary procedures to comply with not only the requirements of the credit card company but also the bank.

Mr. Hornung noted if you have a credit card machine, people can put money on their credit card, noting that they are smart enough not to put it on their credit card but on a bogus credit card and use it really quick.

Mr. Weaver noted that the new system will be online with the next quarterly sewer bill. He explained that we are accepting delinquent payments through the new service at this time and everyone will be notified that we will not accept payments through Official Payments anymore.

Mr. Weaver noted that from the last meeting Mr. Seeds and the Board asked the status of the PennDOT projects. He explained that he spoke to Mr. Stine about this issue and he advised him that since it is a PennDOT project there is a 20 year life so the balances are due for that time period since it is a State Contract. He noted that we can't take it off the books but we are liable for 20 years. Mr. Seeds questioned if PennDOT is liable to the Township for what they owe us for 20 years. Mr. Stine answered yes. He noted that it is a sealed agreement.

Mr. Weaver noted that the question arose as to who owed who more. He explained that PennDOT never billed the Township for a project from 2.5 years ago where Handworks' costs were \$190,000. He noted that they have not billed us yet. He noted that the newer staff at PennDOT is much better with the billing process as the Authority just received a bill for \$36,000

for the second phase of Nyes Road, but not the first phase. He noted that we owe PennDOT \$190,000 for the first phase.

### **Engineer's Report**

Mr. Kevin Shannon, CET noted that he would touch on a few items that have not been discussed. He noted that CET is working on the Annual Report to DEP that needs to be submitted by June 30, 2013. He noted that there has been a lot of metering in Beaver Creek and all that will be summarized in that report. He noted that he is working on the rest of the projects for design and permitting that need to be done to spend the bond money and have it under contact by November 2014. He noted that he just advertised PC1GAB, PC5 B & E and PC3A projects. He noted that he needs to update the schedule with Mr. Hilson to see when the next public meeting will be held. He noted that the last big project is BC4 which is on the drawing board, but he has more additional projects to get out.

Mr. Shannon noted that the PennDOT section of the report did show more activity than in most quarterly reports with two projects; one at Mountain Road where they are replacing the ACP sewer in Blue Bird Road and at Lockwillow Avenue. Mr. Hornung noted that he was told that it would be done in two days and then they had to do the laterals, he questioned why they were not done at the same time. Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Ronca is not close to the project and must have forgotten. Mr. Hilson noted that he was only thinking of the mainline and not the lateral work. He explained that he wanted to do the main line work at both locations and then come back to do the laterals from the house all the way out to the main line. He explained that it would not work due to the paving schedule that PennDOT established for that road. He explained that Ronca had to change his plan as he gets paid by the foot of pipe he lays. He noted that pipe laid is pipe paid. Mr. Weaver noted that the work will be done tomorrow morning.

Mr. Shannon explained that the Linglestown Road shop drawings are going back and forth. Mr. Hilson noted that it is a PennDOT betterment project where they will redo the entire road and as a part of that the Authority is replacing its sewer lines. He noted that the contractor is Handwork and they did not do a thorough job with their shop drawings and they finally got them all to CET; however, they couldn't order their supplies without the shop drawings, and they are three weeks out to get manholes. He noted that stormsewer work will also be done. Mr. Seeds questioned who is doing that. Mr. Hilson answered that it would be the same contractor. Mr. Hilson noted that the pipes to the pump station are done and Handwork will connect to them.

Mr. Shannon noted that the Department of Community and Economic Development announcement will be accepting grant applications until June 28, 2013 for infrastructure projects that benefit economic development. He suggested that the Gale Drive and Oakhurst Interceptor projects would fall into that category as development can't occur in that area until the work is done. Mr. Wendle noted that it costs about \$10,000 to complete an application, paying for the time it takes to put the application together. He noted that last time the Township applied for a Commonwealth Financing Agency (CFA) grant, it did so using a group of attorney's, who took 10% of the grant in fees. He noted that CET was just as successful in getting the grants approved as that group was and he does not charge a percentage. He noted that \$10,000 would be a good budget number and he questioned if the Authority wanted to risk those funds to possibly secure a grant. Mr. Seeds questioned what the Authority's chances are to acquire a grant Mr. Wendle answered that he had no idea. He noted that they are looking for shovel ready projects and we are ready to go. Mr. Weaver noted that they are offering \$17.5 million in grants for the Commonwealth. Mr. Seeds questioned how much could the Authority apply for. Mr. Shannon answered that \$5 million is the maximum that the Authority could apply for any one project. Mr. Seeds questioned if the Authority would qualify for a grant. Mr. Weaver answered yes as we are shovel ready with our projects. He noted that the City of Harrisburg needs money bad but they may not be shovel ready and have permits for their jobs. He noted that he would like to do a joint request with Susquehanna Township for the Oakhurst Interceptor. Mr. Wendle noted that it may provide an advantage if two municipalities apply for a grant.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the Longhorn Steakhouse would be viable. Mr. Wetzel noted that the ARA basin is completed. Mr. Wolfe noted that there are no sanitary sewer improvements in the Township for that project.

Mr. Weaver noted that DCED will ask in the application how many jobs this would create for temporary and permanent jobs. He noted that it is a difficult question to answer under the last grant application that we applied for and were the recipient of \$1 million. He noted if we are awarded \$5 million at a cost of \$10,000 that is a good deal. Mr. Seeds noted if the chances are 50/50, it is worth the money. Mr. Crissman noted that he likes the ability to apply as joint communities as it may weigh more in the process. He questioned who does the approval of these grants and who where do they live. Mr. Wendle answered that the group of attorneys who took a percent the last time the Township applied stated that they had political connections at DCED,

but his experience is that the local representative and senators are the best people to contact to get approvals. He suggested that they may be able to call this board to get something done.

Mr. Weaver questioned if Mr. Wendle could do the application in 30 days. Mr. Wendle answered yes. Mr. Wolfe questioned the Board if they wanted Mr. Wendle to prepare an application for financing to CFA. Mr. Crissman questioned if Susquehanna Township would be amenable to the joint application. Mr. Weaver suggested that they are a little hesitant since they are already involved in two grants. Mr. Wendle noted that they are doing a project on Front Street but he did not see why they wouldn't want to be part of this. He suggested that the two Townships' should apply for the Oakhurst Interceptor jointly and Lower Paxton should apply for the Gale Drive rehab project. Mr. Weaver noted that the Oakhurst Interceptor project is a \$1 million project and the Gale Drive project is \$3.5 million. Mr. Seeds questioned if we should apply for both. Mr. Weaver answered yes. Mr. Wendle noted if he does both projects it would not cost \$10,000 for each project as there would be some duplication in the work and the one application fee would be split with Susquehanna Township.

Mr. Weaver questioned Mr. Wendle if Susquehanna Township was using CET to do their applications. Mr. Wendle answered yes.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to authorize Mr. Wendle to apply for both the Oakhurst Interceptor and Gale Drive projects to the CFA for grants, doing a joint application with Susquehanna Township for the Oakhurst Interceptor project. Mr. Hawk seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Mr. Shannon noted that he put the ARA meter curve in the report. He noted since the last meeting there were a few more wet weather events to show how successful the Asylum Run project was. He explained that the 45 degree line on the chart was the Pre-Rehabilitation metering and the one on the bottom showed the Post-Rehabilitation metering.

Mr. Shannon noted that we are in the process of trying to close the PENNVEST Loan noting that he is trying to convince DEP that this was a very successful project and to approve the change orders that were issued for the job. He noted that there are some change orders in the ARA project... Mr. Wolfe noted that we did not do the work under I-83 and it reduced the cost. Mr. Weaver noted that he would not ask the Board to apply for a PENNVEST loan in the future as they are very cumbersome.

Mr. Shannon noted that next in line to be metered are SC1E and PC2C to determine how successful the projects were.

Mr. Seeds questioned if DEP had to approve the change order for the PENNVEST loan since the project did not go under I-83. Mr. Shannon explained with the PENNVEST loan, DEP is the administrator for that loan and they must review all the engineering and information. He noted that they must approve every change order. Mr. Shannon noted that it has been a painful process. Mr. Weaver noted that the loan amortization that they sent to the Authority was wrong, noting that the Authority only spent \$9.9 million of the \$13 million applied for, and PENNVEST reduced the loan payment schedule from 20 years to 12 years thinking that since we borrowed less, we could pay it off earlier. He noted that is not what we want. Mr. Wendle explained that he was told that it would be reduced when the loan is closed out. Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Wendle submitted the final drawings to them for approval.

Mr. Seeds noted that on page one there is a reference to overflow sites. Mr. Shannon noted that there are several places throughout the system in all basins in Beaver and Paxton Creeks where there were manhole overflows. He explained that it was a convenient means to relieve the sewer by taking the lid off, and putting an overflow box on top of the manhole, and meter that overflow. He suggested that there are 10 or 11 locations where this was done. Mr. Seeds questioned if it was a wooden box. Mr. Wendle answered that it was a metal box about 18 inches high. Mr. Wolfe suggested that we view one on the next road tour. Mr. Shannon noted in the past quarter Mr. Wetzel picked three more locations to install the overflow boxes to be able to control the overflows and measure them.

Mr. Weaver noted in Paxton Creek, the City of Harrisburg backs up the system during extreme events; with the knowledge from the metering program we have figured out better location to put overflow boxes. He noted that Mr. Wendle recommended overflow pipes that would prevent some basement backups. Mr. Seeds questioned where you would send the overflows to. Mr. Wendle answered into the stream. Mr. Weaver noted that it overflows and we would get fined for it but it is better to put it in the stream then into someone's basement. Mr. Hornung noted that he likes that idea. He noted that he wanted to make sure we weren't bolting down manholes. Mr. Wendle noted that there is an overflow in someone's backyard and they are looking to move the manhole into the woods.

Mr. Seeds noted that everyone is doing an excellent job.



### **Solicitor's Report**

Mr. Stine had nothing to report.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, Mr. Crissman made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Blain seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 7:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen A. Heberle  
Recording Secretary

Approved by:

William L. Hornung  
Authority Secretary